

**Notice of Allowability**

Application No.

09/909,241

Examiner

Michael B. Holmes

Applicant(s)

MANCISIDOR ET AL.

Art Unit

2121

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--**

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to April 01, 2005.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 54-86 (renumbered as 1-33).
3. ☒ The drawings filed on 05 December 2001 are accepted by the Examiner.
4. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some\*   c) ☐ None   of the:
    1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.  
**THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.**

5. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
  6. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
    - (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
      - 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
    - (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
7. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

**Attachment(s)**

1. ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2. ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3. ☒ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08),  
Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit  
of Biological Material
5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6. ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413),  
Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
7. ☐ Examiner's Amendment/Comment
8. ☒ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
9. ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 – [WWW.USPTO.GOV](http://www.USPTO.GOV)

### Examiner's Detailed Office Action

1. Claims 54-86 (renumbered as 1-33) are allowed.
2. Examiner's note: Regarding the present application, full faith and credit has been granted the work performed by the prior Examiner. Moreover, Examiner has determined there are no outstanding double patenting issues regarding applicant's prior issued patent (6,745,172) and the present application number 09/909,241.

### REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

3. The following is an Examiner's statement for reasons for allowance:
4. The closest prior art *Coleman* (USPA PUB: 20030061202) does not teach or render obvious applicant's claimed invention. In particular, as pointed out below, the prior art lacks certain features and the combination as specified in the respective claims.
5. With regards to claim 54 *Coleman* does not disclose " ... c) *determining a problem domain based at least in part on the set of problem answers; d) presenting a set of needs questions to the customer, the set of needs questions including one or more questions corresponding to the determined problem domain; e) receiving a set of needs answers from the customer, the*

*set of needs answers including one or more answers to the set of needs questions, each needs answer corresponding to at least one of the one or more product needs of the customer; f) transforming at least a part of the set of needs answers into one or more values to represent a set of product traits, the one or more values comprising at least one of a fuzzy value or a crisp value, at least a portion of the one or more values corresponding to at least one of the one or more product needs of the customer; g) processing at least one of the one or more values to produce one or more product recommendations, wherein the one or more product recommendations correspond to the determined problem domain, wherein at least a portion of the step of processing is performed on a computer processor using fuzzy logic; and h) providing at least one of the one or more product recommendations to the customer.”*

6. With regards to claim 80 Coleman does not disclose “ ... c) processing the received input through fuzzy logic to produce one or more product recommendations corresponding to the customer's product needs, the step of processing comprising transforming at least a part of the information relating to a customer's product needs into at least one of a fuzzy value or a crisp value; and d) displaying an output to the agent via the GUI, the output comprising the one or more product recommendations.”

7. With regards to claim 84 Coleman does not disclose “ ... i) transforming at least a part of the set of answers into one or more values to represent a set of product traits, the one or more values comprising at least one of a fuzzy value or a crisp value; at least a portion of the one or more values corresponding to at least one of the one or more product needs of the customer, and ii) processing at least one of the one or more values to produce one or more product recommendations, wherein at least a portion of the step of processing is performed on a computer

Art Unit: 2121

*processor using fuzzy logic within the computer system, wherein the output comprises one or more product recommendations corresponding to the customer's needs; and e) presenting at least a portion of the output to the customer via the agent."*

### Correspondence Information

9. Any inquires concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael B. Holmes, who may be reached Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. EST. or via telephone at (571) 272-3686 or facsimile transmission (571) 273-3686 or email [Michael.holmesb@uspto.gov](mailto:Michael.holmesb@uspto.gov).

If you need to send an Official facsimile transmission, please send it to (571) 273-8300.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful the Examiner's Supervisor, Anthony Knight, may be reached at (571) 272-3687.

Hand-delivered responses should be delivered to the Receptionist @ (Customer Service Window Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22313), located on the first floor of the south side of the Randolph Building.

*For Anthony Knight*  
*Ramesh Patel*  
**RAMESH PATEL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER** *7/25/05*

**Michael B. Holmes**  
Patent Examiner  
Artificial Intelligence  
Art Unit 2121

United States Department of Commerce  
Patent & Trademark Office

Tuesday, July 19, 2005

MBH